



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,958	10/30/2001	David George De Vorchik	MFCP.88142	6989
45809	7590	12/21/2004	EXAMINER	
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. 2555 GRAND BOULEVARD KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613			KISS, ERIC B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2122	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicant No.	Applicant(s)
	10/015,958	DE VORCHIK ET AL.
	Examiner Eric B. Kiss	Art Unit 2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2001.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-15 have been examined.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: “component”, near the end of line 5, should be made plural. Appropriate correction is required.

Further, the Examiner suggests the following alternative wording for claim 4, lines 11-13:

wherein control is transferred between said host-wizard and said one or more sub-wizard components through said host navigational component and said sub-wizard navigational component, thereby creating an extended wizard.

This suggestion is provided merely to promote clarity in the disclosure, and Applicant is free to adopt or ignore this suggestion at their discretion. It is noted, however, that the provided suggested wording would help in overcoming the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as detailed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2122

4. Claims 1-6, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the following limitations:

"said host-wizard" in line 5;

"said one or more sub components" in line 5; and

"said host component execution" in lines 5-6.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. In the interest of compact prosecution, lines 5-6 of claim 1 are subsequently interpreted as *said host-wizard component invoking said one or more sub-wizard components during an execution of said host-wizard component*, for the purpose of further examination.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "at least one of said sub-wizard interfaces" in lines 9-10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In the interest of compact prosecution, the affected limitation is subsequently interpreted as *said sub-wizard interface*, for the purpose of further examination.

The limitation in lines 11-13 of claim 4 is not positively recited, *i.e.*, the claim recites the passive form, "can be transferred," making it unclear whether these features are part of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2122

Claim 5 recites the limitation "said one or more sub-wizards" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In the interest of compact prosecution, the affected limitation is subsequently interpreted as *said one or more sub-wizard components*, for the purpose of further examination.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "said one or more sub-wizards" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In the interest of compact prosecution, the affected limitation is subsequently interpreted as *said one or more sub-wizard components*, for the purpose of further examination.

Claim 8 recites the following limitations:

"said host component " in line 5;
“said one or more sub components” in line 5; and
“said host-wizard component execution” in lines 5-6.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. In the interest of compact prosecution, lines 5-6 of claim 8 are subsequently interpreted as *said host-wizard component invoking said one or more sub-wizard components during an execution of said host-wizard component*, for the purpose of further examination.

Claim 9 recites the following limitations:

"said host component " in line 6;
“said one or more sub components” in line 6; and

“said host-wizard component execution” in lines 6-7.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. In the interest of compact prosecution, lines 6-7 of claim 9 are subsequently interpreted as *said host-wizard component invoking said one or more sub-wizard components during an execution of said host-wizard component*, for the purpose of further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 7, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Alex Fedorov, et al., “Professional Active Server Pages 2.0,” 1998, Wrox Press Ltd (hereinafter *Fedorov et al.*).

As per claim 7, *Fedorov et al.* discloses providing a host wizard (*seismic.asp*, an Active Server Page that causes the loading and display of a wizard dialog box; see, for example, the last paragraph on p. 423); providing a web component comprising: a web page containing a header area, a wizard control area and a control interface area (see, for example, the screenshots of the wizard dialog on pp. 424-426), the control interface area having navigation control means for

recursive navigation within said web component and to said host wizard, by utilizing one or more object module functions enabling navigation (the screenshots of the wizard dialog on pp. 424-426 clearly show the “< Back” and “Next >” navigation controls). *Fedorov et al.* further discloses providing a user interface that integrates the web component into the host wizard (the user-interface is provided by *equakeget.htm*, an HTML page, which interacts with the user and submits entered results to the Active Server Page script in *seismic.asp*; see, for example, “Submitting the Data” on p. 431); and providing an information container to exchange informational items between the web component and the host wizard (a return string is generated to convey the results; see, for example, “Submitting the Data” on p. 431).

As per claim 10, this is a computer readable medium version of the method discussed above (claim 7). The use of such a computer readable medium, such as memory, is further inherent in realizing the computer-implemented functionality disclosed by *Fedorov et al.*

As per claim 11, this is a computer system version of the method discussed above (claim 7). *Fedorov et al.* further discloses the prescribed methods as being computer-implemented (for example, the screenshots on pp. 424-427 illustrate execution within an Internet Explorer web browser environment, which inherently requires a processor and a memory to function as illustrated/described).

7. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,574,791 to Gauthier et al.

As per claim 1, *Gauthier et al.* discloses providing a host-wizard component (see, for example, col. 9, line 56, through col. 10, line 5); providing one or more sub-wizard components

(see, for example, col. 9, line 56, through col. 10, line 5); and said host-wizard invoking said one or more sub components during said host component execution (see, for example, col. 9, line 56, through col. 10, line 5).

As per claim 2, *Gauthier et al.* further discloses the sub-wizard component being a browser based object component (see, for example, col. 18, line 66, through col. 19, line 30).

As per claim 3, *Gauthier et al.* further discloses the sub-wizard component being an operating system based application component object extension (the basic functionality of the computer system disclosed by *Gauthier et al.* is controlled by operating system 100; see, for example, col. 6, lines 42-46).

As per claim 8, this is a computer readable medium version of the method discussed above (claim 1). *Gauthier et al.* further discloses the use of such a medium to implement the prescribed methods (see, for example, col. 5, line 52, through col. 6, line 4).

As per claim 9, this is a computer system version of the method discussed above (claim 1). *Gauthier et al.* further discloses the use of such a system to implement the prescribed methods (see, for example, col. 5, line 24, through col. 6, line 46).

As per claim 4, *Gauthier et al.* discloses a host wizard having an interface adapted to communicate with other wizards (see, for example, col. 9, line 56, through col. 10, line 5) and a host navigational component adapted to transfer control to other wizards (see, for example, col. 10, lines 57-67; and col. 14, lines 9-14); wherein said host wizard can communicate with one or more sub-wizard components through the host-wizard interface and sub-wizard interfaces (see, for example, col. 9, line 56, through col. 10, line 5; col. 10, lines 57-67; and col. 14, lines 9-14); and wherein control is transferred between the host wizard and the sub-wizard component

through the host navigational component and the sub-wizard navigational component (see, for example, col. 10, lines 57-67; and col. 14, lines 9-14).

As per claim 5, *Gauthier et al.* further discloses the sub-wizard component being a browser based object component (see, for example, col. 18, line 66, through col. 19, line 30).

As per claim 6, *Gauthier et al.* further discloses the sub-wizard component being an operating system based application component object extension (the basic functionality of the computer system disclosed by *Gauthier et al.* is controlled by operating system 100; see, for example, col. 6, lines 42-46).

As per claim 12, *Gauthier et al.* discloses providing a first wizard (see, for example, col. 9, line 56, through col. 10, line 5); providing a second wizard (see, for example, col. 9, line 56, through col. 10, line 5); and providing at least one navigational component on each of said first and second wizards allowing sequential progression or regression through said first and second wizards to chain said second wizard to said first wizard (see, for example, col. 10, lines 57-67; and col. 14, lines 9-14).

As per claim 13, *Gauthier et al.* further discloses the first and second wizards each being an operating system based wizard (the basic functionality of the computer system disclosed by *Gauthier et al.* is controlled by operating system 100; see, for example, col. 6, lines 42-46) or a web based wizard (see, for example, col. 18, line 66, through col. 19, line 30).

As per claim 14, this is a computer system version of the method discussed above (claim 12). *Gauthier et al.* further discloses the use of such a system to implement the prescribed methods (see, for example, col. 5, line 24, through col. 6, line 46).

As per claim 15, this is a computer readable medium version of the method discussed above (claim 12). *Gauthier et al.* further discloses the use of such a medium to implement the prescribed methods (see, for example, col. 5, line 52, through col. 6, line 4).

Art Unit: 2122

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Eric B. Kiss whose telephone number is (571) 272-3699. The Examiner can normally be reached on Tue. - Fri., 7:00 am - 4:30 pm. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam, can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EBK/*EBK*
December 7, 2004

[Handwritten Signature]
TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER